

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/639,056	BENNETT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles G. Freay	3746	

All Participants:
Status of Application: pending

 (1) Charles G. Freay.

 (3) William Dalton (Inventor).

 (2) George Chaclas.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 1 June 2005
Time: 12:00
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 11, 17 and new claims 22 and 23

Prior art documents discussed:

Reuter et al (USPN 5,715,674) and Maker et al (6,412,271)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner and the applicant's representative, along with Inventor Dalton, discussed the claims with regards to Fig. 5 of Maker et al and the Reuter et al reference. The examiner noted that in Maker et al the control valve was represented by the central valve member (46) which is within the pressure/regulator spill valve (43) and has a single control input (the static line from the output of the metering valve (42)) and in Reuter et al there is a control valve (208) and a pressure regulator (164). The examiner noted, and the applicant agreed, that the claimed invention differed from the above noted references in the following ways: the control valve (26) was located in a flow line (36,42) and had two control inputs (41,43); the flow line (36) to the control valve was separate from the spill return flow and communicated directly with the output from the pump; and an orifice (48) connected to the output of the pressure regulator (22) was used to create a pressure differential across the control valve. amendments to claims 1, 11, 17 and new claims 22 and 23, as set forth in the examiner's amendment, were agreed to which specifically set forth the above noted differences .